

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Claims:**

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 4-13 have been amended, and claims 2 and 3 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1 and 4-13 would still be pending.

**II. Claims Objections:**

Claims 8, 11 and 12 are objected to as containing minor informalities. The Applicant has amended the claims to address the Examiner's concerns. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are respectfully.

**III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103:**

Claims 1-5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi (US Patent No. 5,999,707) in view of Kawamura (US Patent Pub No. 2002/0155808 A1). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Kawamura and further in view of Werb (US Patent Pub No. 2003/0013146 A1). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Kawamura and further in view of DPFOF Version 1.10. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Kawamura and further in view of Miyasaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,362,896) in view of Horst (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,967). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Kawamura and further in view of Kanakubo (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,252). Claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Kawamura and further

in view of Miyasaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,362,896). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Kawamura and further in view of Shigemori (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,963). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Kawamura and further in view of Miyasaka and Chiba (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,088).

As reflected in claim 1 as amended, a remaining storage capacity of a memory for storing data received from a communication partner is discriminated. Further, a communication partner is instructed to transmit data having a designated data length, and the communication partner is interrupted to transmit the data by setting the designated data length of the data to zero.

In contrast, Taniguchi discloses that a printer requests the computer to transmit a print content data, receives the print content data and prints the print content data.

Kawamura discloses that a NULL packet is used for transmitting/receiving a status of a communication link to/from a communication counterpart.

Werb discloses that, if no User Data is included in a Datagram, zero is set in a Data Length field.

DPOF Version 1.10 at website on July 17, 2000 discloses explanation of DPOF, but does not disclose explanation of Bluetooth.

Miyasaka discloses that, when an error which is occurs in a printing apparatus is recovered, the printing apparatus resumes printing sequence.

Horst discloses using a HALT command to terminate a communication between a CPU and packet interface.

Kanakubo discloses a printing apparatus which shuts off a power supply when an error occurs.

Shigemori discloses resending the agent. Moreover, Chiba discloses resending data.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references discloses or suggests that the communication partner is instructed to transmit the data having the designated data length which is set to zero.

Specifically, Kawamura and Werb show that the data length of the data to be transmitted is set to zero. However, these references do not show that the communication partner is instructed to transmit the data having the designated data length and the communication partner is interrupted to transmit the data by setting the designated data length of the data to zero, as reflected in claim 1.

Thus, the cited references, individually or in combination, are not believed to teach or suggest or render obvious the above-noted claimed aspect. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited references, individually or in combination. For similar reasons, claim 13 is also believed to be distinguishable over the cited references, individually or in combination.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

**AUTHORIZATION**


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5375.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5375.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: January 22, 2008

By:



James Hwa  
Registration No. 42,680  
(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

**Correspondence Address:**

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101